DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 329 535 SP 032 932

AUTHOR Bower, Ann M.; Kosuda-Elacqua, Valerie
TITLE Facilitating the Professional Role of Special Education Teachers: Two Mentoring Models for Self-contained and Resource Classrooms.
PUB DATE Feb 91
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators (71st, New Orleans, LA, February 16-20, 1991).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Beginning Teacher Induction; *Beginning Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; Mainstreaming; *Mentors; Models; Program Design; *Resource Teachers; *Self Contained Classrooms; Special Education; *Special Education Teachers; Student Needs

ABSTRACT

Two models for the mentoring of beginning special education teachers are presented. The first, the self-contained urban model, is a special education model designed by mentor teachers for beginning and experienced teachers of self-contained classrooms at both the secondary and elementary levels. Mentors work with interns for one full day each week when both are released on a regular basis from classroom instruction. Mentors are experienced, highly regarded special education teachers, with an ability to work with adults, who are matched with two interns. The second model is an experimental model for resource teachers that is expected to have a direct, positive effect on a maximum number of students and will be piloted in 1991-1992. This is a mentoring model that allows an experienced and a novice consultant teacher to work with exceptional students within the students' regular classroom environment, rather than being "pulled out" to receive support services. The concept is based on the placement of mildly handicapped students in the least restrictive environment. As a result, students are provided access to the regular curriculum. The potential strengths of these two models are described and some possible difficulties are noted. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED329535

Facilitating the Professional Role of Special Education Teachers: Two Mentoring Models for Self-Contained and Resource Classrooms

by

Ann M. Bower, Ed. D.
Educational Events
Syracuse, New York 13215

and

Valerie Kosuda-Elacqua, M. S. in Ed.
East Hill Elementary School
West Genesee School District
Camillus, New York 13031

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A. D. Bower

V. Kosuda-Elacqua

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Presentation and paper prepared for the 71st Annual Meeting of the National Association of Teacher Educators in New Orleans, Louisiana, February 16-20, 1991. Paper available from Dr. Bower, Educational Events, 4888 Coventry Road, Syracuse, New York 13215. Tel. (315) 468-1487.

SP 032 232

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Facilitating the Professional Role of Special Education Teachers: Two Mentoring Models for Self Contained and Resource Classrooms

by Ann M. Bower, Ed. D. and Valerie Kosuda-Elacqua, M. S. in Ed.

Introduction

Within the field of special education there are nationwide shortages of experienced, competent teachers prepared to deal with the ever-increasing population of students with special needs (The Council for Exceptional Children, 1990; Gursky, 1989; McLaughlin, Valdivieso, Spence, Fuller, 1988). As more special education positions become available because of teacher attrition, high "burn out" rates, and an increase in students with disabilities (Fox & Forbing, 1991; Cherniss, 1988; Hawley, 1986; Houck, Engelhard, & Geller, 1990; Reynolds, 1990; Weiskopf, 1980; Zabel & Zabel, 1982), the more fortunate school districts will be those districts to which an abundance of qualified, experienced and inexperienced special education teachers apply for jobs. Less fortunate districts sometimes have to turn to brand new teachers from other disciplines, but with no special education background; next to job seekers with a college degree but no education background whatsoever (Bower, 1990; Huefner, 1988) in order to fill these particular openings. Due to an influx of new teachers who are often less-than-ideally prepared for this

field, special education mentoring models are some of the more important mentoring models for a district to consider implementing.

While the demands on adequately prepared neophyte special education teachers are considerable, these same demands can appear insurmountable to those beginning teachers who are not as well prepared to work with exceptional students (Bower, 1990). In instances then, in which ill-prepared, novice special education teachers are placed with students who have severe emotional and physical needs, the mentoring of these teachers may be crucial, both to neophyte teachers and the young people in their care.

The research shows that forty percent of new teachers (in all grades and disciplines) leave teaching within three years (Dronka, 1987). Fifty percent of the beginners in urban schools quit or leave in three to five years (Haberman, 1990,p.5). "Attrition rates" in special education "were found to be especially high in rural districts and inner-city schools (Reynolds, 1990, p.425)." It seems reasonable to assume then that some of the most demanding positions (among which are many special education jobs) open up for new hires on a fairly regular basis. As a result, students with disabilities are likely to have more experiences with less-experienced and/or emergency certified special education teachers than

other non-handicapped students have throughout their schooling. Yet the atypical learners in these special education classes may have a greater need for "truly expert and intensive teaching over longer periods of time (Reynolds, 1990, p. 433)."

Even first year teachers who are adequately prepared need time to modify their expectations to coincide with the reality of the classroom (Weinstein, 1988), practice good methodology, manage an abundance of paperwork, as well as monitor and adjust for each new challenge. Their students also have to cope with (or "take advantage of") whatever time it takes the novice teachers to adjust to the rigors of the classroom. Yet it seems clear that students in special education, even more than "average" students, cannot afford to lose any part of another year's learning without having their academic difficulties compounded.

Since it appears likely that shortages of special education teachers will persist in the foreseeable future, formalized mentoring experiences, inside or outside of induction programs, hold much promise for improving the experiences and skill of new special education teachers, whatever their level of preparation. The formal matching of a well regarded, experienced special education teacher (a mentor) to a beginning special education teacher (an intern) can provide the guidance and assistance

needed to arrive at "win-win" situations for both neophyte teachers and the exceptional students with whom they work.

Self-contained and Resource Classroom Models

Two different models for mentoring in special education are herein suggested for adaptation and/or implementation within school districts.

The self-contained urban model. The first is a special education mentor teacher-designed model for beginning teachers and experienced teachers of self-contained classrooms at both the elementary and secondary levels. This particular model, which will be further discussed as Model A, was observed by one of the authors of this paper throughout the school year, 1987-1988, the second year of its existence in an urban school district in upstate New York. Continuance grants for the implementation of this particular special education mentoring model have been awarded to that particular city district on a yearly basis since the beginnings of New York State's Mentor Teacher-Internship Program (MT-IP) in 1986.

MT-IP places much emphasis on the development of the mentor-intern relationship, requiring mentor release from ten percent of classroom instruction time per intern (with a maximum of four interns

per part-time mentor). Interns must be released from twenty percent of classroom instruction. In other funded district's MT-IP's requirements for teacher-released time are often met on a daily basis. The creators of this model, however, envisioned the bulk of mentoring of special education interns to take place for a full day each week. This kind of flexibility of design is encouraged in the State's Request for Proposals (RFP's) of mentoring projects, as long as mentor and intern receive the necessary time away from class and students in order to develop a facilitative relationship. Of course an optimal meeting place for a mentor and the two interns with whom he/she works would be the building in which all three teachers work. Quite often this is not realistic, however, and one, or on rare occasions, two persons must travel to the school building of the third person in the triad. As the urban district in which Model A continues to be implemented copes with an overcrowding problem, the mentor and interns sometimes have to travel to any building which can provide them the space in which to work. While traveling to another building is perhaps a less-than-an-ideal situation, the provision of an entire workday allows those teachers who must travel to a different building to arrive at the same time they would normally report to their regular teaching assignment. Then they can stay in that one location for the whole day.

Thus, no time is wasted in transit. The mentor's and interns' classes are covered by substitute or "replacement" teachers hired to teach on that particular weekday for the entire school year.

Considerable benefits result from the availability of an uninterrupted mentoring day that seem particularly helpful to the needs of special education teachers. These benefits, as well as factors that could prove problematic, will be described in detail in another section of this paper.

The resource teacher/"push in" model. The second model under discussion has been designed by a practitioner in the field of special education, who is a resource teacher and the second contributor to this paper. This model, further addressed as Model B, will be piloted in the school year, 1991-1992, in a suburban elementary school in an upstate New York school district.

Model B is presented as a mentoring model that allows an experienced consultant teacher and an novice consultant teacher to work with exceptional students within the students' regular classroom environment, rather than being "pulled out" to receive support services. This is in line with the new direction suggested by the New York State Education Department guidelines for implementation of programs for

special education students serviced by special education teachers in the role of consultant teacher. An experimental program of this nature is sometimes called a "Class within a Class" (CWC) approach (National Educators' Division of Special Education, 1990). The concept is based on the placement of mildly handicapped students in the least restrictive environment (LRE). As a result, students are provided access to the regular curriculum.

The design of Model B is also in keeping with the intent of the restructuring movement referred to as REI or the Regular Education initiative (Kauffman & Hallahan, 1990; McLeskey, Skiba, Wilcox, 1990) that is gaining momentum among some special education and regular education professionals. The model offered here might be considered an initial step towards REI, but it is not necessarily a recommendation of the REI movement by the authors of this paper. Instead, they support Muir and Hutton's position (1989) that "REI, if implemented at all, should be experimentally tested with learning disabled and behavioral disordered students. Then perhaps we will know better how to think about" its merits.

Model B restructures the schedules of a resource special education mentor teacher, a resource special education intern teacher, a speech

therapist, and a PSEN (Pupils with Special Educational Needs) reading and math instructor. Even more than Model A, it requires administrative and staff support, plus an openness to innovation and experimentation on the part of the staff that chooses to participate. In addition, this kind of "push-in" program would necessitate not only much preplanning and cooperation between teachers, but also agreement and endorsement of parents.

A District-wide Model within the New York State Mentor Teacher-Internship Program - Model A

The self-contained special education model, Model A, was designed by special education mentor teachers working in an urban school context in upstate New York (See Fig.1). The model was piloted in a city district in 1986-1987, observed in operation in 1987-1988 (Bower, 1990), and continues to be funded in the same context within the guidelines of MT-IP. Because of the nature of the more thorough study involved in the second year of research on this project, the names of the mentors and the district must remain confidential.

"A critical component of MT-IP was the release of both the mentor

and the intern from some instructional duties in order to support the development of the relationship. Funds were provided by the State in order to provide extra time within the school day to address issues that were of importance to each particular dyad. Intern participants were to carry no more than an 80% classroom assignment, while mentors could be released 10% of their instructional day per intern assigned to them (Bower & Yarger, 1989)." These part-time mentors were required to carry a minimum 60% teaching load. The manner in which each project provided this time sometimes varied considerably.

The advantages of Model A. The simple structure of the design of Model A seems particularly appropriate to satisfying the needs of self-contained special education teachers, especially in urban contexts. A full day a week without students can be used for a myriad of tasks. Some of the activities observed in this particular project by the researcher included:

A. "Custom tailoring" the subject material to fit the particular needs of the students in an intern's class.

B. Explaining how to complete the copious amounts of required paperwork, such as Individualized Education Plans (I.E.P.'s), parent notification procedures, necessary testing, reports to state agencies.

Model A
Urban Self-Contained Special Education Model

The Design - created by empowered professionals, two special education teachers
Key Concept - mentors work with interns for one full day each week. Mentoring activities take place on this day, which is consistent for a particular mentor and his/her interns. Mentoring days are different days of the week for each particular triad of mentor and two interns.

The Schedule - Typical, traditional schedule of particular school
Four days a week

Atypical schedule
One particular weekday each week (Ex: Wednesdays) mentors and interns are released on a regular basis from classroom instruction.

Participants - Mentors - Numbers vary with number of interns
They are considered to be experienced, highly regarded special education teachers/ role models with an ability to work with adult learners.

Interns - Numbers vary as district needs vary
They are considered to be full time, first year special education teachers with varying degrees of preparation.

The Match - Each mentor is matched with two interns. Project coordinator arranges the match with input from mentors involved. Final approval lies with the superintendent.

The Relationship - Every relationship between a mentor and a specific intern is considered separate and distinct. A mentor-intern relationship evolves through the use each pair makes of the released time, plus any additional time the mentor and intern spent together.

The Physical Arrangements - room made available on consistent basis in any school building, preferably one in which one or more participants work.

Class Coverage - specific substitutes are hired to teach the same class on a regular basis one full day a week - now called "replacement teachers" because they are sometimes included in planning, invited to meetings about both students and operation of the project.

Training - Mentors are encouraged to attend a conference on mentoring and/or peer coaching.

Interns with no special education background are required to attend a graduate course leading to permanent certification each semester and during the summer.

Fig. 1 - Particulars of urban special education mentoring model- Model A

C. Going on home visits with someone experienced in working with parents of students with special needs.

D. Observing intern teaching with provision for immediate feedback. (This could be accomplished by a mentor switching a half day with another mentor who was released on a different week day.)

E. Participating as a triad on field trips to other special education classes (in the same/other districts) or institutions which work with and service persons with disabilities.

F. Evaluating the correct placement of students.

G. Sharing of resources or facilitating the search for correct materials.

H. Planning of "team" type extracurricular activities with other classes within a particular building.

I. Making and delivery of plans.

J. Facilitating an understanding of different committees on special education, stressing the importance of interns' participation.

K. Discussing the students' personal and academic problems in a attempt to reach resolution.

L. Listening to personal and professional problems of interns.

M. Dealing with difficulties that can result from mainstreaming students.

N. Attending to the needs of a particular intern - For example, if one intern seeks additional assistance in the creation of tests, time is available. The other intern can choose to work on that same, particular aspect of his/her teaching, get paperwork done with the mentor available to help, observe another special education teacher, attend a half/whole day workshop in an area of interest to him/her, etc.

The above list is not exhaustive but indicates just some of the activities which can be accomplished much more effectively and efficiently than if they had to be "sandwiched" into short time periods made available within a school day.

Potentially Problematic Areas. One of problems encountered during the pilot year of the implementation of Model A was the unanticipated difficulty of one of the mentor teachers (a co-designer of the model) had in adjusting to time away from her exceptional students. She found it was troublesome to her when a student from her class created problems on mentoring day or looked throughout the building for her. She worried about continuity of instruction in her classroom. She spoke about the

and/or newly retired teachers looking for more regularly scheduled part-time work rather than substituting on an "as needed," basis. The same replacement teacher on a certain day every week also provides a more stable environment for the students because the teacher is known to them and, in turn, becomes familiar with their needs and personalities.

Even if different substitute teachers have to be used for the provision of a mentoring day, a substitute teacher is only there for one day of a particular week. If, on the other hand, a new teacher leaves mid-year because no one is there to assist him/her with the pressures of the first year, the students will have substitute teachers daily until/if another permanent teacher can be found.

A Mentoring Model within a Modifiable Schedule for Teachers of Support Services

The second model, Model B, will be partially piloted by a resource mentor teacher and an intern teacher with whom he/she works during the next school year 1991-92. The work of these resource teachers, as well as the work of other teachers of support services, has been scheduled into the traditional time blocks around which the regular elementary teachers

have always worked. While a specific elementary school's schedule is used in Model B's design, it would seem that many other such schools would find the model easily adaptable to whatever schedule is in use at their location.

The Pairing Schedule for Model B. The framework for Model B, called a Pairing Schedule, is displayed with time slots compatible with a particular elementary school's schedule revolving around a student body of about 500 students (See Fig. 2). The word, pairing, in the name of the schedule suggests the use of consecutive grades in which students in need of particular resources are teamed together for service delivery by teachers of support services.

This schedule permits the resource teachers to concentrate on necessary skill-oriented tasks of identified students in the morning sessions when they "push into" a participating teacher's class. In the afternoon, there is a distinct difference between available time slots. An additional 30 minute session (content oriented) is provided a minimum of one day per week per participating teacher. (Since it is content-oriented, no cross grading will occur.) If some students need supplementary help beyond the services offered in either skill or content, these students can

Pairing Schedule

*Resource (Mentor)	Resource (Intern)	Sp/Lang, PSEN Reading/Math
8:20-8:40		
Collaborative plan time for Specialists and on	(Mon.)	5th grade teachers
	(Tues.)	3rd " "
Additional plan time as per teacher schedules	(Thurs.)	1st " "
8:40-9:00		
Collaborative plan time for Specialists and on	(Mon.)	4th grade teachers
	(Tues.)	2nd " "
Additional plan time as per teacher schedules	(Thurs)	K " "
9:00-9:30		
M & I Plan Time	M & I Plan Time	S/L & PSEN Plan Time
9:30-10:20		
1st or K (A.M.) groupings as per individual needs/ appropriateness for reading/math or writing.	1st or K (A.M.) groupings as per individual needs/ appropriateness for reading/math or writing.	1st or K (A.M.) groupings as per individual needs/ appropriateness speech/lang.,reading or math.
10:25-11:15		
2nd or 3rd groupings as per individual needs/ appropriateness for reading/math or writing.	2nd or 3rd groupings as per individual needs/ appropriateness for reading/math or writing.	2nd or 3rd groupings as per individual needs/ appropriateness speech/lang.,reading or math.
11:20-12:10		
4th or 5th groupings as per individual needs/ appropriateness for reading/math or writing.	4th or 5th groupings as per individual needs/ appropriateness for reading/math or writing.	4th or 5th groupings as per individual needs/ appropriateness speech/lang.,reading or math.
12:10-1:00		
Lunch/M & I Plan	Lunch/M & I Plan	S/L,PSEN Lunch/ Plan
Could be collaborative (with classroom teacher/specialists) or individual.		
1:00-1:30		
1st or K (P.M.)	1st or K (P.M.)	1st or K (P.M.)
Mon. _____	Mon. _____	
Tues._____	Tues._____	
Wed. _____	Wed. _____	as appropriate
Thurs._____	Thurs._____	
Fri. _____	Fri. _____	
See Below for explanation **		
1:30-2:00		
2nd or 3rd	2nd or 3rd	2nd or 3rd
Mon. _____	Mon. _____	
Tues._____	Tues._____	
Wed. _____	Wed. _____	as appropriate
Thurs._____	Thurs._____	
Fri. _____	Fri. _____	
See Below for explanation **		
2:00-2:30		
Extra help as per group or individual with tradtional pull out or push-in.	Extra help as per group or individual with traditional pull out or push-in.	as appropriate
2:30-3:00		
4th or 5th	4th or 5th	4th or 5th
Mon. _____	Mon. _____	
Tues._____	Tues._____	
Wed. _____	Wed. _____	as appropriate
Thurs._____	Thurs._____	
Fri. _____	Fri. _____	
See Below for explanation **		
3:00-3:40		
M & I Plan Time	M & I Plan Time	S/L & PSEN Plan Time

*Read down column for schedule of support teachers.
**Both mentor and intern could be used on a certain day(s) each week to push-in directly with a particular teacher/group of students for small group instruction, reinforcement of content or as a 'second pair of hands' for difficult activities, e.g. experiments. Open blocks of time used by M & I for I.E.P's, lesson plans, and discussion.

Figure 2. Schedule for resource/mentoring restructuring model-Model B

easily be slotted into the 'extra help' session between 2:00 and 2:30 P.M. on a "pull out" basis, regularly or as needed, for resource work during an afternoon session. Besides assistance to students, the generous amount of planning time this particular schedule allows is conducive both to individual teacher and collaborative mentor-intern needs.

A Mentoring Model for Resource/ Consultant Teachers - Model B.

Model B has been practitioner-designed around a restructuring concept for the delivery of remedial/support services. In this model, appropriate students in consecutive grades are grouped together for remediation of/ assistance in academic areas mindful of their individual and collective needs. The model is centered around four goals:

a) provision of a mentoring opportunity for beginning resource/consultant teachers with collaborative experiences continuing after the novice's entry level year. Time is also made available for the new resource teacher to work with other support service teachers.

b) implementation of a configuration which would provide identified students access to the regular curriculum, greater opportunity for congruency, and

less fragmentation of their schedules.

c) provision for the elementary teacher to receive additional classroom assistance for children with academic difficulties (identified or not), with less fragmentation of their available instructional time, and direct reinforcement of concepts and skills in small groups.

d) maintenance of service delivery to a full load of twenty identified students per resource teacher.

Model B takes place within the Pairing Schedule (see Fig. 2). It requires the teachers of support services to meet with self-selected elementary grade teachers for a minimum of twenty minutes once a week on designated days. For example, teachers of support services, namely the resource mentor and intern, a speech/language therapist, and a PSEN reading and math instructor, would meet for two twenty minute periods at the beginning of each school day with (a) fifth grade teacher (s) from 8:20 to 8:40 a. m. and from 8:40 to 9:00 a. m. with (a) fourth grade teacher(s). The resource mentor and resource intern teacher would then have one half hour daily after each morning meeting to outline how they might best

proceed to assist the students in need within a particular class. Additional time in which the dyad can meet and work together is planned at lunch time and at the end of the day, from 3:00 p.m. to 3:40 p. m.

Since services in the afternoon are provided in blocks of time as per individual/group needs, it is conceivable that there could be other occasional blocks of time when the mentor and/or intern would not be scheduled. This time could be used for the development of materials, testing, reports, etc..

Structurally, Model B is much more complex than Model A. Even though the regular elementary school schedule remains in tact, the more traditional locations of the resource teachers, the PSEN instructor, the speech and language therapist, and/or the students with special learning needs are changed. These logistical changes potentially provide sufficient time for the development of a mentor-intern relationship, more completely integrated exceptional students, and better communication among all the teachers involved.

The grouping of appropriate students is a key concept of Model B. Students in consecutive grades are placed together for skill-oriented, support/remediation services as per individual and collective needs, in blocks of time throughout morning sessions. Other professionals provide

their small group instruction within the same block of time, though not necessarily within the same classroom. Teachers with the highest concentration of needy students may have assistance for additional afternoon slots within their classroom. A portion of the model, using identified students in combined 4th and 5th grade groupings, will be field tested in the East Hill Elementary School of the West Genesee School District, Camillus, New York. Consideration of self-esteem issues will allow students to be moved only from a lower grade to a higher grade grouping, for example, only from the 4th grade to the 5th grade, never vice versa. Non-identified students will be included as space allows. If the piloting of this part of the model proves successful, plans will be set in motion to incorporate other grade groupings in this building.

The flexibility inherent in Model B maximizes the amount of planning time available for the experienced and neophyte resource teachers who work together. Time is built into the school day for the mentor and intern to work together. Many of the activities that Model A facilitated (p.9,11,12) are also facilitated in this model. In addition, the intern teacher would be able to grow in knowledge about speech, reading, math, and regular education. He/She would be exposed to cooperative planning strategies and steps to integrate isolated skills into specific content

Model B
Resource Teacher/"Push In" Mentoring Model

Design - restructuring ideas and framework are practitioner designed in a three stage format:

1.Troubleshooting stage — Tentative Time Schedule
Discussion/Debate - Feb.
Adoption of Negotiated Terms-Mar 1

Issues:

A) Union and administrative concerns - particularly in relation to grouping
B) Incentives for regular education volunteers - additional plan time to replace time given over to weekly morning consultation or lower caseloads
C) Any significant I. E. P. modifications for individual students involved
D) Provision for mentor training
E) Other

2. Preplanning stage — Tentative Time Schedule for
Teachers of Support Services
Discussion/Collaboration/ Decisions
In place by May

Basic requirements:

A) Selection of grades and teachers involved
B) Identified students in specific grades will be grouped according to similarity of needs
C) Mentor training and/or peer coaching course for resource mentor

3. Implementation stage-

Participants:
1 full time resource mentor teacher
1 full time resource intern teacher
1 full speech/language therapist
1 full time PSEN reading and math instructor
Self selected classroom teachers at participating grade levels

Design:

Three significant features:

1.) Morning session (skill oriented)
Includes:
A. Collaborative planning period between regular educators and specialized educators
B. Time block for mentor and intern to prepare together for assistance needed
C. Time blocks for specialized educators to "push in" and provide assistance to students grouped in consecutive grades according to needs

2.) 1/2 Afternoon session (content oriented)
Includes:
A. Incorporates flexible "push in" services on an "as needed" basis from resource teachers
B. Accommodation for "as needed" mentoring

3.) 1/2 Afternoon session
Includes:
A. Traditional "pull out" program
B. Time at the end of the day for mentor-intern interaction

Fig. 3- Particulars of resource teacher mentoring model within "push-in" program

areas, techniques that could take years to develop on one's own.

Troubleshooting the areas of concern. As in all untested models, some problematic areas must be considered and addressed. Coordinated and priority scheduling must be addressed long before the beginning of the school year. During initial preparation of implementation plans, real and possible costs must be brainstormed before a final budget package is submitted. Since volunteer regular education teachers would be giving up individual planning time at least once a week, the need to replace this time may require some degree of increased staffing or creative use of available personnel.

There could be contractual concerns with the movement of/increase in staff. In addition, those persons who oversee contractual arrangements may perceive that grouping identified students based on needs could potentially overload certain teachers. There would need to be provisions made to safeguard against placing too many students with (a) particular skill deficiency(ies) in one teacher's classroom.

Before actual implementation of the complete model, particular variables should be relatively certain. These variables include the number of identified students, the extent of their needs, and the flexibility, skill

in consultation, and adaptability of personalities among members of the collaborative team.

Since the assumption is made that the beginning resource teacher will be retained, once mentored, the mentoring model within a "push in" program would change in nature, becoming a pure "push in" model the second year of existence. The mentoring aspect of this model can easily be revived, however, if one of the two resource teachers leave. A more complete model can be reinstated when another elementary building in a district wants to provide the support that a new resource teacher needs while beginning the move toward greater integration of handicapped students within the regular classroom. Other districts interested in adoption of a modified version of this model might do well to consider the aforementioned variables, as well as the size of the school in which Model B would be piloted and the staffing restrictions of such a school. Providing a block scheduling preference and adequate physical space, complete with room dividers or other necessary equipment is also strongly suggested.

Eleven steps to successful implementation. It is believed that Model B can substantially benefit students and teachers. There are, however,

prioritized steps that should be in place before a school begins to implement this model:

1. Seek full administrative and union support.
2. Recruit teachers willing to participate. Do not require or force adoption of the model.
3. By May of the year preceding implementation, resource and volunteer regular education teachers should work together to identify and group students within heterogeneous classrooms. Students should be clustered by needs as much as possible, mindful not to overburden any one teacher.
4. Hire a new special education resource teacher.
5. Rework the schedules of gym, art, and music to accommodate a common block of time for "push in".
6. Provide incentives to each participating regular education teacher in the form of the promise of support personnel, increased plan time for collaboration and/or reduced class size.
7. Accommodate the nature of the "push-in" part of the model to individual teacher styles and specific student needs. Decide what is acceptable within the

definition of "push in," for example, 'class within a class'; 'an extra pair of hands'; 'indirect consultation.'

8. Consider the impact of this model on current practices in developing the Individualized Education Plan (I. E. P.) Phase I and II.
9. Start small in order to enhance the likelihood of success. Begin with one pairing group, e. g. 4th and 5th grades. Gradually expand into other grades until school wide, if and when appropriate.
10. Provide a form for keeping collaborative conferences on track.
11. Consider applying for teacher center/competitive grant funding for summer development of collaborative curriculum development and mentor/intern training.

These steps are now being be set in motion in preparation for piloting the aforementioned section of Model B for learning disabled children and children-at-risk-of-falling-behind in school at the above cited elementary school. Once field-tested and refined, Model B appears

capable of providing more adequate assistance to identified students who receive resource support than was previously delivered. Furthermore, the model serves the beginning resource teacher as well. He/She is encouraged to persist and helped to better service his/her students through the provision of considerable time in which to work with a mentor in the field of special education, and/or watch and observe the work of this experienced colleague with both teachers of regular education classes and those of other support services.

Conclusion

Two models for the mentoring of beginning special education teachers have been presented herein: A tested, continuing model for teachers of self-contained, special education classrooms that can have an indirect, positive effect on a maximum number of students, Model A; and an experimental model for resource teachers that is expected to have a direct, positive effect on a maximum number of students, Model B. The provision of additional time for the development of the mentor-intern relationship is important to both of these models. Moreover, in both models, changes take place in traditional schedules during the work week of the mentor teachers and intern teachers.

The demand for teachers of special education is growing daily, yet little is being done to ease the increasing demands on these valued professionals. Through the presentation of these models, this paper offers change-producing concepts for reflection and possible adoption that can reduce the stress and burnout of novice teachers in special education, while benefitting their students who often view themselves as incompetent learners.

References

Bower, A. M. (1990). The nature of formalized mentor-intern relationships in a beginning teacher induction program. Unpublished dissertation. Syracuse University.

Bower, A. M., & Yarger, G. (1989). Mentor-intern relationships in New York State's formal program: Beginnings. Action in Teacher Education, 11(2), 60-65.

Cherniss, C. (1988). Observed supervisory behavior and teacher burnout in special education. Exceptional Children, 54(5), 449-454.

The Council for Exceptional Children. (1990). A brief look at the 12th annual report to the U. S. Congress. Teaching Exceptional Children, 22(4), 71.

Dronka, P. (1987). Study backs induction schools to help new teachers stay. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Update, 29(4), 1,6.

Fox, C. L. & Forbing, S. H. (1991). Overlapping symptoms of substance abuse and learning handicaps: Implications for educators. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 24(1), 24-31.

Gursky, D. (1989). Looking for a short cut. Teacher, 1(3), 42-49.

Haberman, M. and Smith, S. (1990). Two views of Teachers for Our Nation's Schools: A western educator - An urban educator. ATE Newsletter, 24(2), 4-5.

Hawley, W.D. (1986). Toward a comprehensive strategy for addressing the teacher shortage. Phi Delta Kappan, 67(10), 712-718.

Houck, C. K., Engelhard, J. B., and Geller, C. H. (1990). Special education supervisors' perceptions of secondary LD programs: A comparison with LD teachers' views. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 23(5), 320-324.

Huefner, D. S. (1988). The consulting teacher model: Risks and Opportunities. Exceptional Children, 54(5), 403-414.

Kauffman, J. M. & Hallahan, D. P. (1990). What we want for children: A rejoinder to REI proponents. The Journal of Special Education, 24(3), 340-345.

McLaughlin, M.J., Valdivieso, C.H., Spence, K.L., Fuller, B. C. (1988). Special education teacher preparation: A synthesis of four research studies. Exceptional Children, 55,(3), 215-221.

McLeskey, J., Skiba, R., & Wilcox, B. (1990). Reform and special education: A mainstream perspective. The Journal of Special Education, 24(3), 319-325.

Muir, S. & Hutton, J. B. (1989). Regular Education Initiative: Impact on service to mildly handicapped students. Action in Teacher Education. XI(3),7-10.

National Educators' State Division of Special Education Newsletter. (Winter, 1990). "Class Within a Class": An experimental program in Missouri brings special education teachers into mainstream classes. Counterpoint.

Reynolds, Maynard C. (1990). Educating teachers for special education students. In W. Robert Houston's (Ed.) Handbook of Research on Teacher Education (pp. 423-436). New York: Macmillan

Weinstein, C. (1988). Preservice teachers' expectations about the first year of teaching. Teaching and Teacher Education, 4(1), 31-40.

Weiskopf, P. E. (1980). Burnout among teachers of exceptional children. Exceptional Children, 7(1), 18-23.

Zabel, R. H., & Zabel, , M. K. (1982). Factors in burnout among teachers of exceptional children. Exceptional Children, 49 (3), 261-263.